Q
11
.N524

TRANSACTIONS
of
THE NEW YORK ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

SER. II, VOL. 9 FEBRUARY, 1947 No. 4

SECTION OF PSYCHOLOGY*

JANUARY 20, 1947

DOCTOR WALTER V. BINGHAM, Personnel Research and Procedures Branch, Adjutant General's Office, War Department, Washington, D. C.: *Practical Problems of Military Psychology in War and Peace.*†

What kinds of psychological inquiry are likely to be of concern to the armed forces during the next few years? Will they represent extension of the activities carried forward by the 1300 psychologists who wore the uniforms of the services or were employed by them between 1940 and 1946?[1]

It should not be assumed that the future will repeat the past. A global government may eventually be achieved in which the only need for weapons, soldiers, and military psychologists will be to help in maintaining the peace when some arrogant dictator threatens to provoke a third world war.

* The Section of Geology and Mineralogy held a meeting on January 6, 1947, at which Doctor S. W. Muller, Department of Geology, Stanford University, Palo Alto, California, presented a paper on *Permafrost*, illustrated by lantern slides. No abstract of this has been received.

The Section of Biology held a meeting on January 13, 1947, at which Doctor I. S. Danielson, Lederle Laboratories Division, American Cyanamid Company, Pearl River, N. Y., presented a paper on *Gas Gangrene, with Special Reference to Recently Developed Toxoids*, illustrated by lantern slides. This will be published in a later issue of TRANSACTIONS.

† The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not represent an official policy.

TRANSACTIONS of The New York Academy of Sciences, Series II, Volume 9, No. 4, February, 1947.

This publication is distributed to Members and is published monthly from November to June, inclusive, at 109 West Chestnut Street, Lancaster, Pa., by The New York Academy of Sciences, Seventy-ninth Street and Central Park West, New York 24, N. Y.

Editor: Roy Waldo Miner.

Associate Editor: Lothar Salin.

Executive Secretary: Eunice Thomas Miner.

Entered as second-class matter December 2, 1938, at the post office at Lancaster, Pa., under the act of August 24, 1912.

NOTE: This number contains the A. Cressy Morrison 1947 Prize Contest Announcement (see page 158).

Neither is it assumed that the pattern of warfare would closely resemble World War II. In comparison, any future war is likely to be vastly more extensive, more destructive of civilians, more depersonalized in combat, and more highly mechanized. But like its predecessor, it will be initiated by undeclared aggression and a surprise attack. Moreover, the activities of the contenders will be subject to familiar limitations of human capacity, and this is why it is reasonable to suppose that, as long as there is need for an army of occupation, or for a world police, or for a system of national defense, just so long will there be technical problems of military psychology.[2]

Thus, in the design and use of new weapons and equipment, psychologists have been, and in the future will be, called upon to bring to bear their insight, their knowledge of human capabilities, and their methods of scientific attack.[3] Similar demands arise in the design of clothing and gear adapted to the mental as well as the physiological comfort of the wearer when campaigning in the desert, in the tropics, or in the frigid polar regions; when escaping from a submarine, or bailing out of a jet-propelled airplane in the stratosphere.

The discovery, assessment, development, and conservation of aptitudes has been, and will continue to be, central in the domain of military psychology. To maximize the nation's human resources by facilitating the growth and optimal utilization of potential capabilities is a worthy goal during any period of peace. If the war clouds gather again, it will become an imperative of survival. So, within the next few years, we must place ourselves in a superlative position to husband our abilities and strength.

Educational psychologists of World War II developed ways of salvaging for military usefulness hundreds of thousands of illiterates and other slow learners.[4] The civilian economy should carry on here, in order to augment our total strength whether for peace or for war.

Similarly, at the other end of the scale of abilities, the psychologists found vast resources of talent only partially developed. For example, among those soldiers who had not completed a high school course, there were upwards of a million whose potentialities, as indicated by scores on the Army General Classification Test, paralleled those of college and professional men.[5] Thanks to a wise Congress, many of these are now pursuing courses of study they could not other-

wise have afforded. Improvement of means of identifying superior talent will surely be a continuing topic of research.

Of particular interest to the military services are means of measuring potential and actual ability to lead men: to train, supervise, care for, inspire, and control them. Steps in that direction were taken when it became necessary to select for commissions in the Regular Army only the best from among a large number of very able wartime officers who had applied for these appointments. Improved procedures, described in the *Infantry Journal*,[6] mark advances in methods of military appraisal which are now being adapted to the purposes of periodic rating of officers and selection of men to attend officer candidate schools.[7] Still better tests of leadership will, in due course, be devised.

The armed forces will surely maintain an active interest also in problems of clinical psychology. Indeed, they are now recruiting specialists in this field for duty in consultation services at training centers, and in neuropsychiatric wards of Army hospitals.

The systematic study of attitudes and opinions is a technical field not to be neglected by an army which aims to keep a finger on the pulse of its personnel.

Equally essential in war is contact with the mind of the enemy. How can we best monitor and analyze his broadcasts? How should we ascertain the effects of military campaigns or of different patterns of strategic bombardment on the morale of his civilian populations and his troops? What truths of ours, what ways of informing him, are our most potent weapons of psychological warfare?

If ever again America should approach the catastrophe of war, answers to these imperative questions of military psychology should already be at hand.

REFERENCES

1. **Britt, S. H., & Jane D. Morgan**
1946. Military psychologists in World War II. Am. Psychologist **1**: 423–437.
2. 1945. Post-war psychological services in the armed forces. Psychol. Bull. **42**: 396–398.
3. **Hunter, W. S.**
1946. Psychology in the war. Am. Psychologist **1**: 479–492.
4. **Witty, Paul A., & Samuel Goldberg**
1943. The army's training program for illiterate, non-English speaking, and educationally retarded men. Elementary English Rev. **20**: 306–311.

5. **Bingham, W. V.**
1946. Inequalities in adult capacity, from military data. Science **104**: 147–152.
6. **Clarke, J. M.**
1946. Picking the 9,000. Infantry J. **59**: 7–13.
7. **Sisson, E. D.**
1946. What War Department psychologists do. Army Inf. Dig. **1**: 46–51.

SECTION OF ANTHROPOLOGY

JANUARY 27, 1947

DOCTOR MARGARET MEAD, The American Museum of Natural History, New York, N. Y.: *The Application of Anthropological Techniques to Cross-National Communication.**

During the war, anthropologists addressed themselves to various ways in which their discipline could be put at the direct service of their society, attempting to short-cut the lag which normally obtains between the development of abstractions based upon laboratory and field research and their application to contemporary problems. One part of this anthropological effort was concerned with delineating significant aspects of the national character, or culture pattern, of enemy peoples or peoples of occupied countries about whom our knowledge was wholly inadequate.†

A second use of anthropological techniques was found in the attempt to select salient aspects of our own cultures and describe them in such a way that they could be used for various sorts of rapid training or morale building.‡

The use of anthropological knowledge in operations directed towards the enemy involved only a limited analysis of our own culture, except when a policy had to be carried out by large numbers of Americans whom it was impossible to train in detail to act in any way antithetical to their usual behavior, or when, as in our formal treatment of the Japanese emperor, widespread public support of a national policy was necessary. The use of similar anthropological knowledge within the limits of our own culture raised all the ethical problems of the responsibility of leaders of a democratic society not simply to manipulate, but to appeal openly to existing and cherished strengths.

* This research is part of the program of the Institute for Intercultural Studies.

† The most significant work was done on Japan and Germany. Reference may be made particularly to **Gorer,**[3] **Benedict,**[4] **Round Table on Germany after the War,**[27] **Parsons,**[28] and to unpublished work by Gregory Bateson, Ruth Benedict, Geoffrey Gorer, Douglas Haring, Frederick Hulse, Clyde Kluckhohn, Alexander Leighton, David Mandelbaum, Arnold Meadow, Rhoda Metraux, Marian Smith, and others. Some of the general implications of this work are described by **Mead**[16] and **Benedict.**[4]

‡ Some of the principles for such a treatment of our own culture were discussed in **Bateson & Mead.**[3] The method was exemplified by the work of the Committee on Food Habits,[26] particularly by the methods of pattern analysis of verbal materials on attitudes to current situations developed by **Metraux**[29] and **Mead.**[11]

When an attempt is made to use the anthropological methods to strengthen a relationship between peoples of two contemporary cultures, still different problems arise. Here, the focus is not upon points of vulnerability (which may be breached, as with the enemy, or strengthened, as for members of occupied countries), nor upon traditional strengths and coherencies to be enhanced and weaknesses and contradictions to be guarded against, as in work in one's own culture. Instead, our efforts have to be directed towards finding areas of agreement which can be used as a background for the acceptance of differences which are causing specific friction and tension. Research and resulting communications are focused upon a relationship, and the nodes selected for emphasis are defined in terms of that relationship, not in terms of the emphasis within the whole culture pattern of each society. For instance, if foreign policy is to be discussed and the foreign policy of one culture is most congruent with upper class values, while in the other it is most congruent with middle class values, this asymmetry would be consciously explored, perhaps to the neglect of any exploration of the exactly corresponding class in the other country, because of its lack of immediate relevance to the problem in hand.

As illustrative material for such an operation, I shall draw upon my own experiences in working on Anglo-American relations. I particularly propose to use data upon the areas of friction and misunderstanding between American troops and British civilians in Britain in 1943. My case is unusual because I had the opportunity to participate in framing the hypotheses with which I went to Britain, to combine field work on these hypotheses with lecturing all over Britain, under the auspices of the Ministry of Information and, later, through the United States Office of War Information in London, to prepare various sorts of materials, both as background and immediate communication, for circulation among Americans and Britons. Thus, activities which would more usually be divided among a large number of individuals with different skills—research, field work, analysis, interpretation, preparation of directives, writing, rewriting, broadcasting, presentations, etc.—and which would be subject to all the hazards which attend communication within such a diversified group, were embodied in the work that I did. This is an accident which we have no reason to believe will be repeated often. Analysis of such an experience bears the same relationship to thinking about cooperative opera-

tions that an analysis of the functions of the vanishing general practitioner bears to an attempt at constructing modern medical services in which many disciplines participate. This experience also provided a unique opportunity to explore some of the problems involved, and to test our hypotheses on the spot.

I plan to discuss examples of a variety of the procedures and problems which arose, so as to give as broad a picture as possible of the way in which anthropological methods may be applied to relationships between any pair of peoples. The analysis of such binary relationships is a necessary step towards an understanding of more complicated patterns of relationship on which a world order will have to be built.

I have used the term, cross-national, deliberately, to indicate that I am dealing not with relationships between *nations*, self-maximating competitive national units, but between the *peoples* of different nations, whose effective communication is a compromise of both differences in culture and the circumstance of different nationality which gives a special competitive coloring and significance to these differences. To the extent that local allegiance is an important ingredient of the picture of the own group, the acceptance of differences in culture will vary enormously, according to whether any sort of boundary, even a state or county line, intervenes. In wartime, uniforms and all the paraphernalia of nationalistic warfare exacerbate the sensitivities of the populations involved.

Application of General Theoretical Formulations to a Particular Case

In the initial steps, I depended upon the formulations of symmetrical and complementary schismogenesis, developed by Gregory Bateson,[1, 2] in which the United States and Britain were both diagnosed as relying upon the stimulus provided by greater strength in the opponent, while Germany seemed to rely upon greater weakness. With this approval of symmetrical relationships shared by both countries, there was associated a common moral disapprobation of bullying, picking on someone who was smaller, throwing one's weight around, etc. In addition to the original statement of this diagnosis, I had elaborated, before going to England, the American version of adequate provocation to attack, under the formulation of "the chip on the shoulder."[13] In this, I stressed that the American boy, reared by women, was given a

deep doubt of his essential aggressiveness, combined with a lack of pattern for exercising it, in contrast to the British boy, reared by older boys and men to combine a belief in his innate aggressiveness with an obligation never to use his full strength unless pushed into an extreme position in which he could turn at bay. The famous "Back to the Wall" order of Haig in World War I to the British, and reported exhortations of General Patton to his men, emphasizing the difficulty of the task but also the fact that the enemy was on the run and the United States Army had the best equipment in the world, are conspicuous examples of the way in which military leaders have intuitively relied upon these different patternings of a basically symmetrical schismogenic attitude. Phrased colloquially, the underlying similarity became, "Both British and Americans believe that the strong have an obligation not to abuse their strength. We both hate bullies and, conversely, those who cringe to bullies."

The second theoretical formulation was the hypothesis of *end linkage* (Bateson[2]) that the way in which parent-child relationships are patterned in respect to succouring-dependence, dominance-submission, and exhibitionism-spectatorship, provides a learning situation for the child which patterns his subsequent behavior in situations where these behaviors are involved. Specifically, in Anglo-American relationships, the exhibitionism is reversed. In Britain it is Father who exhibits to his children: he is the model for their future behavior. Father does the talking and provides the model, before a very quiet and submissive audience, in accordance with the deep ethical disapproval of over-use of strength. He underplays his strength, understates his position, speaks with a slight appearance of hesitation in his manner, but with the cool assurance of one who knows. In the United States, this position is reversed: at the American breakfast table, it is not Father but Junior who talks, exhibits his successes and skills, and demands parental spectatorship and applause with an insistence that can be clamoring and assertive because, after all, he is speaking from weakness to strength. The American background for this reversal was explored[11] and, in the spring of 1943, we tried an experiment of using the contrast in a radio program in which samples of parent-child behavior at the breakfast table were followed by excerpts from American and British public speeches.*

* This program was given as part of the series, *Science at Work*, of the American School of the Air of the Columbia Broadcasting System[7] and was published in *Education*.[1] The two speeches ran as follows:

These two formulations, of symmetrical schismogenesis and endlinkage, provide both a theoretical background for understanding and material for interpreting one of the acute points of friction between British and Americans. This point of friction was the British repudiation of American "boasting" and the American repudiation of British "arrogance." It lent itself particularly well to use on the lecture platform and over the radio, as tone of voice was the principle medium in the demonstration. By a little careful interviewing in each new area in Britain, I could get *verbatim* (and, therefore, acceptable) statements of the British objections: "The trouble with the Americans is that when they are good at something they *say* so", or "The trouble with the Americans is that they talk so much about what they are going to do; we don't talk, we just *do* it" (from the Scots), etc. I could then rely upon the lecture situation, itself one in which the exhibitionistic role of the lecturer and the spectatorship role of the audience was defined, to provide me with additional illustrative material. I could quote from the chairman who, in presenting me—putatively in the parental role on a British stage—to a great tired audience who had come out in the blackout on a freezing Sunday night in Scotland, said: "Be as kind to the audience as you can, Dr. Mead." Or I could refer to the whole institution of the "vote of thanks," in which the British audience, after sitting docile and respectful while the lecturer plays Father, reestablishes the balance by the paternalistic tone in which the proposer of the vote of thanks addresses the now seated lecturer. Explanations of behavioral differences which stressed upbringing were easily acceptable to the British, because of the strong cultural emphasis upon "character" as something which is acquired in the course of the right education rather than as an innate possession of any indi-

British Lecturer: "Ladies and Gentlemen—I have been asked to talk to you tonight about British war production. We have, of course, improved. Our over-all figures for the past year show a definite increase. But it is, I think, in planes that the picture is most striking. Our largest bombers, which incidentally carry four times the bomb load of yours, are now coming quite satisfactorily into production."

American Lecturer: "Well, ladies and gentlemen—I see I'm down on the program to talk to you tonight about Alaska. I can think of one good reason why I know something about that country. It's because I've had to make upwards of 20 to 30 trips there, Summer and Winter in the past fifteen years.

Two or three of these trips, I might add, were by dog sled, far off the beaten track. On at least one of them, I nearly lost my life. But the thing I want to tell you folks about tonight, is the change that's come over Alaska since our boys went in there. Yes sir . . . mass production methods and the Good Old American qualities of hard work and initiative are showing results up there these days. (fading) I predict that five years after this war finishes, we'll be spending Summers in Alaska the way we used to spend Winters down in Florida. That's a tip, folks."

vidual or class of individuals. It was possible to show that, whenever an American spoke, he spoke as he had learned to speak when he was small, and so would put that irritating overstatement into his voice which the British called "boasting"; while, whenever a Briton spoke, he spoke as he had heard his father and other elders speak, as the strong and assured, carefully pulling his punches, with that irritating understatement in his voice which the American called "arrogance." It was possible to show how the words *understatement* applied to the British and *boasting* applied to the Americans, emphasized the virtues of British behavior and devalued American, while by using the parallel words *understatement* and *overstatement*, both British and American behavior could be put in a common frame, *viz.*, that of habits learned in childhood.

Exploration of a Friction Point

When I reached Britain, our troops were still pouring into the country, there were still many British troops around, and very few American girls had, as yet, reached Britain. The relationships between American men and British girls were providing an acute point of misunderstanding among both nationalities.

The friction took many forms, which required quite different types of treatment. It was necessary to explain to British authorities that an American boy would have difficulty in judging the age and degree of discretion of a girl who told him she had been out of school and working for two years, and to construct ways in which the Americans could spend their disproportionately large pay on British girls without using up goods or creating new social problems. But there was the much more basic problem of the way in which disturbed heterosexual relationships were festering beneath the surface of Anglo-American relationships in general. The problem was not primarily a police problem involving the reduction of illegitimate births, which seemed to be following a pretty uniform curve whichever troops and nationalities were involved, but rather to reduce the disorientation which expressed itself in the British statement that the American men were "immoral" and the American insistence that the British girls "had no morals." Accusations of this sort might, of course, have been mere expressions of symmetrical friction, in which case it would have been necessary to look elsewhere for more basic areas of discrepancy. However, there is al-

ways a good possibility that, under identical accusations, there will be expressed some profound and unrealized difference which has become the more dangerous because it is so completely masked.*

I set about to explore the relationships between American men and British girls. A key to the misunderstanding lay in the differences in the location of responsibility for sex advances and sex refusals; in fact, for the whole modulation of sex behavior. The American girl is trained to look after herself, unchaperoned and without any insistence upon rules of etiquette which will insure her person immunity from physical advances. She is taught that her behavior is in her own keeping, and the boy learns to make advances and rely upon the girl to repulse them whenever they are inappropriate to the state of feeling between the pair. In Britain, the situation is reversed: the girl is reared to depend upon a slight barrier of chilliness and frostiness which the boys learn to respect, and for the rest to rely upon the men to approach or advance, as warranted by the situation. Both systems give about the degree of satisfaction which can be expected in any pattern which locates initiative formally in one sex, without reference to temperament, in the respective countries concerned. In wartime Britain, however, it meant that American boys, taught to ask with a full expectation of being refused effectively most of the time, were confronted by British girls, taught to accede to every forceful invitation. Several characteristic patterns of response developed. Some British girls became even chillier and, repelling even American optimism, succeeded in keeping the Americans at arm's length and sending them away to complain about everything in Britain. Some responded to the first stylized wisecrack with an impassioned surrender which was thoroughly disconcerting to the American in its intensity and implications. Some, finally, succeeded in maneuvering a middle course for a few hours, until the Americans who seemed to be "serious" could be presented at home as future sons-in-law—which annoyed a great many Americans very much. The interpretation of this difference to the men themselves, and to those who were charged with youth and

* Early in the war, the British were frequently advised, by American expatriates and Anglophiles, to retaliate against American comments about India by remarks about the treatment of Negro Americans in the United States. This *tu quoque* phrasing only increased the bitterness and intolerance on both sides, as the two cases were felt as basically dissimilar by the Americans, who equated Indian problems with American pre-revolutionary problems as a country, and racial problems in the U. S. as equivalent to the slum problem inside Britain, a purely domestic matter.

protection programs, gave a working basis for improved relationships,* and a phrasing under which the mutual accusations of immorality could be reduced.

Problems of Phrasing and Translation

The problem of communication in a language which was theoretically mutually intelligible and "one language," presented a number of difficulties which could be partially resolved by reference to cultural differences. In all probability, the greater the difference between the languages of the pair of cultures with which one is attempting to work, the more automatic warnings are provided to the translator. Between English and American, however, and between other cultures similarly related through a common tradition and a still somewhat intelligible pair of languages, language confuses rather than clarifies, and other sorts of clues are necessary. Two systematic observations made it possible to communicate better. The first was analysis of the difference between the American and British sense of a scale of values. Americans tend to arrange objects on a single scale of value, from best to worst, biggest to smallest, cheapest to most expensive, etc., and are able to express a preference among very complex objects on such a single scale. The question, "What is your favorite color?" so intelligible to an American, is meaningless in Britain, and such a question is countered by: "Favorite color for what? A flower? A necktie?" Each object is thought of as having a most complex set of qualities, and color is merely a quality of an object, not something from a color chart on which one can make a choice which is transferable to a large number of different sorts of objects. The American reduction of complexities to single scales is entirely comprehensible in terms of the great diversity of value systems which different immigrant groups brought to the American scene. Some common denominator among the incommensurables was very much needed, and over-simplification was almost inevitable (Mead[13]). But, as a result, Americans think in terms of qualities which have uni-dimensional scales, while the British, when they think of a complex object or event, even if they reduce it to parts, think of each part as retaining all of the complexities of the whole. Americans subdivide the scale; the British subdivide the object. Americans are able to describe a room in terms

* All of the material outlined in this and preceding sections was used as a background for various educational pamphlets, Mead[17] and[20] ("What is a Date?").

of its "color scheme," where the British eye would retain a sense of some fifty elements involved in the whole interior pattern, even when speaking of a square inch of the rug. From this British insistence on complexity there flows, naturally enough, an insistence upon uniqueness and an unwillingness to make comparisons. Discussions as to the relative virtues of cities, which Americans make happily in terms of size, wealth, or some other common denominator, appear to the British either as meaningless or as irrelevant boasting. In turn, the British refusal to provide statistics on the size or wealth of a city seemed to the Americans to be either obscurantist or unfriendly. In Anglo-American contacts of all sorts, committee meetings, teaching situations, etc., it was important to watch the misunderstandings which arose along these lines, since the British voted the Americans as oversimplifying when they harped on some exact statement of a position on a numerical scale, and the Americans voted the British as inaccurate, if not engaged in deliberate falsification, when they quoted the population of Bengal with an error of ten million, with the statement that it "didn't matter," because they were concerned with the relative, not the absolute size of one Indian province.

Another sort of misunderstanding which influenced communication was the difference between the British and American sense of the real world. The Americans see the world as man-controlled, a vast malleable space on which one builds what one wishes, from blueprints one has drawn, and, when dissatisfied, simply tears the structure down and starts anew. The great sense of mechanical control of the environment—product, at least in part, of an empty continent and the machine age—extends to American attitudes towards crops and animals, which are again something to be planned for, streamlined, increased or decreased at will, and even, to a certain degree, to human beings, who can be, if not completely molded by man-made devices, at least sorted mechanically into simply defined pigeonholes. The British, in contrast, see the world as a natural world to which man adapts himself, in which he assumes no control over the future but only the experienced foresight of the husbandman or the gardener, who plants the best seed and watches carefully over the first green blades. Man is seen as the junior partner of God (expressed in either conventional or more contemporary forms, but still as the junior partner of forces to which he can adapt himself but which he cannot control). He can "only handle

one link in the chain of destiny at a time." The humility of this phrasing has its own forms of arrogance, as in Milton's: "God is decreeing to begin some new and great period . . . what does he then but reveal Himself to his servants, and as his manner is, first to his English-men." *Vis à vis* this state of mind, ordinary American figures of speech implying control and mechanism not only fail to communicate but actually establish barriers. It was necessary to drop the familiar figures of an America converting for full production, laying down blueprinted acres of factories, six months ahead of schedules, and streamlining labor-management relations, and to use instead the figures of speech of horticulture, to speak of "planting the seed" in "carefully prepared ground," of an effort which, even when skill and experience were used to their utmost, still depended in final outcome on forces with which man could cooperate but which he could not control.

Roads and buildings in Britain which have been there a long time, become part of the natural world, not something to be swept aside lightly for a new plan. This was difficult to understand for Americans who often found that a badly bombed city, which was still a wounded landscape to the British once the rubble had been cleared away, looked to them very much like any American city, in the eternal process of rapid transformation in which the old was torn down with hardly a sigh of regret.

The very different sorts of selfconsciousness about all social process also had to be analyzed and allowed for: the American's willingness to think about the immediate future and his unwillingness to think very far ahead; the British unwillingness to let too great a degree of selfconsciousness interfere with the smooth flow of highly disciplined habitual behavior but their greater willingness to think ten years ahead; the sudden shift in British attention which permitted them to attribute to themselves, retrospectively, a degree of planfulness which they would have repudiated, at the time, as paralyzing. I was at first confused by these contradictions, by being told in one breath that to think about next week's plan would be unthinkable, and that, in some earlier operation of exactly the same nature, "we were very clever" and infinitely cunning. Once the contrast was clear, it was possible to discuss the past when any detailed dissection of motive and behavior was desired, and the far future if articulate goals came into question.

The Interpretation of British Behavior to Americans

My formal mandate in 1943 had included only the British side of the task, and the work which I did in the United States was under various scattered auspices and not a part of the Office of War Information program. During the next two years, however, I had occasion to lecture on Britain to various types of professional and popular audiences, to write, and to teach selected groups of personnel destined for the Far East where they would come into frequent and friction-laden contact with the British. The problems of addressing members of one's own culture about their relations with members of another culture presented some distinct features and led to formulations of significant differences which had not been pointed out during my British experience. These differences in insight are to be laid primarily, I think, to the inevitable shift in one's type of participation under the two circumstances. In Britain, I was a friendly visitor, using my professional skill to facilitate relationships between two wartime allies. In the United States, particularly in my teaching role in the various outpost schools, I was concerned with the strengths and weaknesses of Americans for the tasks of cross-cultural understanding which they were going to face. I had to find, if possible, approaches which, in clarifying their own cultural attitudes, would make it possible for them not merely to be more understanding but to act in cross-cultural situations. Furthermore, one faces, in discussing one's own culture with fellow members, a different sort of cross-fire of criticism and is likely, occasionally, to abandon sympathetic impartiality for a note of urgency, if not astringency. In closed classes, designed for war purposes, there were no members of other nationalities, and it was sometimes difficult to convince the students that I would have used the same words and made the same points had there been British in the audience. In all work of this sort, it is essential to speak in terms which envelop the two or more peoples being discussed, and which represent the differences in ways acceptable to both. However, this necessity is more vividly demonstrated if actual human beings of each group are present in the flesh.

Rapport Difficulties

An American addressing an American audience about Britain is speaking to people who have strong and partly unconscious attitudes

about Britain which go very deep,—much deeper than any attitudes which the British, as a group, had about America in 1943. The American sense of national identity contains the earlier and severed relationship with Britain as an intrinsic part, while the British do not use the loss of America as a component of their sense of national identity. Furthermore, in the United States the Anglophile position is traditionally associated with that of the upper-class, the conservative, the wealthy, and the more easterly part of our population—added to the circumstance that the bulk of American tourists before the war were women devoutly following the footsteps of one or another bard. The Anglophobe position contains a mass of assorted elements, Middle West against the East, European ancestry against the older Anglo-Saxon stock, the plain man against the would-be aristocrat, etc. To discuss Britain dispassionately, it was necessary for the lecturer to face and deal with these strong currents of feeling, sometimes existing simultaneously in the same individual. I finally solved this problem, satisfactorily for myself at least, by beginning a lecture with a caricature* of the pro-American British woman, who represents, in capsule form, a way of repudiating the snobbish note which over-sweetened the voice of the Anglophile and of startling the Anglophobe into a provisional (British) identification with the kind of Britons who would not like the type of Americanphile whom I presented. This produced a loosening of traditional identifications, which permitted the clarification material to get a hearing.

A second difficulty arose from the inveterate American habit of asking about every piece of behavior, "Is it better or worse than ours?" This contrast with the British insistence on complexity and, hence, uniqueness, has been discussed above, but it presented itself in a new form as I lectured on British wartime arrangements for community feeding, advising disoriented citizens through the Citizens' Advice Bureaus, or caring for the children of working mothers. Invariably, the American audience wanted to know, "Is their system better or worse than ours?" Behind this question were two unexpressed attitudes: one, the hope that ours would be better and, second, the tacit acceptance of the obligation to copy theirs if ours was worse. As most of the audience vigorously resented any suggestion that they copy Britain, these presentations were always charged with rapport dangers.

* It should be noted that caricatures contain a strong hostile element, which has to be recognized whenever they are used.

It was necessary to stress, over and over again, that the British solution was different, not better or worse. While this point might be surmounted temporarily in a lecture, it usually did not survive in next day's newspaper headlines, and actually represents one of the most serious hazards to any sort of comprehension of other peoples by Americans. A simple sense of either inferiority or superiority would be easier to deal with than this belief that all institutions can be placed on a single scale, and that it becomes the American's obligation to choose the best. The pleasure derived from the study of foreign behaviors which can be voted as inferior is alloyed by the discomfort of encountering those which are superior.

Attitude towards Compromise

American audiences raised a question whose counterpart I never met in Britain. It illustrates how valuable each side of such a relationship is in drawing attention to parts of the whole which the other side might neglect. "Why is it the British always insist on their own way in international affairs and we always lose?" "Why do the British always pull the wool over American eyes?" were frequent questions. In comments upon our international negotiations, the terms "the poor little United States" cropped up with amazing frequency. In working out a clarification of these questions, of this American belief that we always lost, I again sought for a common element in the two cultures against which the differences could be highlighted. Americans share with the British a common tradition in regard to the appropriate behavior of minorities who are minorities because they are in some way more right than the majority. Such minorities, best represented by the long line of dissident Protestant sects, but today also represented by the Roman Catholic minority in England, have been accorded, as part of the whole picture of our form of government, the right to differ and the duty to stand up for their positions. A virtuous minority in both countries is virtuous just because it does not compromise. Here, however, the parallel ends, because the British, speaking from strength, from the paternal position, do not identify government negotiations as made from a minority position. The government acts from strength and, being strong, can *include* some of the minority demands in any proposal. To compromise is the act of the strong and the entrenched, an act of graciousness, expediency, and a recognition

that the heresies of today become the orthodoxies of tomorrow. Thus, in Britain, the word "compromise" is a good word, and one may speak approvingly of any arrangement which has been a compromise, including, very often, one in which the other side has gained more than fifty per cent of the points at issue. On the other hand, in the United States, the minority position is still the position from which everyone speaks: the President *versus* Congress, Congress *versus* the President, the State government *versus* the metropolis, and the metropolis *versus* the State government. This is congruent with the American doctrine of checks and balances, but it does not permit the word "compromise" to gain the same ethical halo which it has in Britain. Where, in Britain, to compromise means to work out a good solution, in America it usually means to work out a bad one, a solution in which all the points of importance (to both sides) are lost. Thus, in negotiations between the United States and Britain, all of which had, in the nature of the case, to be compromises, as two sovereignties were involved, the British could always speak approvingly and proudly of the result, while the Americans had to emphasize their losses. Out of the same ethic, but as contrasting interpretations of our position, came these mutually reinforcing estimates of a document or treaty.

Closely related to this sense of being weak but on the side of the right, and therefore committed to demanding a hundred per cent victories, is the American fear of being exploited by other groups, best summed up in the vernacular phrase, "Don't be a sucker." This is so deeply seated and has been so heavily exploited in discussions of our relationship to other countries, both those who are believed to outwit us in the diplomatic game and those who ask us for help, that it seemed important to analyze it. First, it was necessary to work out the interpersonal dynamics of the conception. A "sucker" in America, who is not to be given an even break, is anyone who enters a game in which he does not have the skill, or wit, or strength, to compete. Superficially, the American ethic that a sucker should be trimmed seems discrepant with the ethic that it is wrong to bully. However, seen against the way in which American boys are reared it becomes intelligible. Instead of the British father who supports the eldest son, as a surrogate of himself, against the competition of the younger sons, and at the same time exhorts the eldest to be gentle but firm, the American boy is reared by a mother who defends the younger against

the elder and continually uses the success of the younger to goad the elder towards achievement. The slightly younger brother, backed up by the mother, becomes a threat, especially to the young boy whose games are continually subject to the intrusion of the younger. This contemporary child-rearing tradition combines with the frontier tradition in which the tenderfoot is a threat to the whole community. Older frontiersmen, alert to the dangers which one careless act may precipitate, and older brothers alert to the way in which the younger may spoil their games, both find refuge in the ethic, "Never give a sucker an even break," an ethic which is also honored by the admission of the American who loses, "I was a sucker, I asked for it." The extent to which this treatment of the sucker may justifiably be classified as a deeply-rooted ethical attitude is illustrated by the report in *Time* (November 6, 1944) in which Oldendorf is pictured with the slogan "never give a sucker an even break," and his adherence to the slogan is then described as accounting for the way in which a successful ambush of Japanese ships was conducted. Stated for American consumption, the havoc was justifiably wrought among the Japanese because they had "asked for it."

At the same time, the word, sucker, is used in another and positively toned sense, to describe the man who is generous, enthusiastic, willing to give of his time and energy, as when a physician remarks in a public speech, "You know doctors always head the sucker list." This is said with approval of the doctor's kind heart and is tantamount to saying, "We are admirably tenderhearted people." Or, the student, cited in a psychological study as a normal, well-adjusted young American, will remark on the offices which he has held in organizations and adds "I'm a sucker for work." This dual attitude towards the sucker position further complicates the American attitude towards other peoples, because it is just when Americans are behaving well that they are most likely to suspect that they are being made suckers against their will. Then the whole negative set of sanctions comes into play, and the ethic of never giving a sucker an even break is projected on to the other national group. The formula reads that we are suckers in the international game, either when we compete or when we are generous, that we aren't up to it, either way, that we are playing a game we do not understand and that, therefore, we will be trimmed. A perfect instance of this interpretation when confronted by the British

insistence on the assumption of an appearance of model, self-controlled parental behavior, was provided in an article by Senator Brewster[6]:

"A number of different diplomatic, commercial, and financial moves will be necessary if we are to hold our rightful place in world commerce, but one of the most important is this: We must stop being out-traded by our good friends the British, the world's greatest experts in economic diplomacy.

"One day I was talking with Sir Gerald Campbell, Lord Halifax's right hand man in the British Embassy in Washington, and I told him I believed our statesmanship is so bad that in nearly every negotiation with the British we came out second best.

"Sir Gerald smiled. 'Of course, we put it over on you,' he said. 'But not half as often as we could!' . . . "

This passage sums up the whole position, the American fear of being trimmed as suckers who do not know the game, the British failure to recognize the issue which is being raised, and their response first with a jocular acceptance of the stated inferiority, which from their point of view takes the sting out, coupled with a statement of the high ethical behavior which all fathers, governors, and persons in authority are supposed to display. The unpalatability of the British reply to the ordinary American can best be stated by referring to the Fijian form of insult in which most enemies were eaten but those who were to be most insulted were cooked and left uneaten. The jocular, Olympian assumption of restraint in the British answer simply exacerbates the American feeling of being treated negligently and condescendingly.

Another pretty example occurred in an article in the *Washington Star,* in 1945,[24] under the heading, "Critics Air U.S.-British Views." One author, Sir John Wardlaw Milne, writes: "In this country we are thankful and *indeed proud* of the great United States, but we heartily dislike the tendency to suggest that America's intervention is a kind of act of grace from some superior beings who need not have engaged in the war at all." (The italics are mine.) Senator Burton Wheeler writes, in the other column: "America wants no more deceptive slogans such as 'Give us the tools, we'll finish the job.' We are not going to tolerate any condescending attitude on the part of anyone that implies or assigns us the status of 'poor relations'." Here, we see the British

tone of speaking from an established position, and discouraging any upstart claims, the American tone of maintaining their rights against those who would put them down.

The phrase *proud of*, so galling to American ears, was a British way of boasting on behalf of the Americans. The whole problem of how Americans should speak of British achievement and British of American was a particularly ticklish one all through the war. After repeated instances of the degree of misunderstanding which was generated by the way in which each ally spoke of its own and allied efforts, Geoffrey Gorer and I worked out a phrasing in terms of the conceptions of partnership which provided a form of clarification suitable for lecturing and teaching. All through the war, the United States and Britain were spoken of as "partners," a word which is common to both languages. But the British associated the word, when applied to international affairs, with a sports concept, with the tennis partner who, for the duration of the game, is treated as like oneself, whose successes one acclaims and whose failures one grieves over. It was possible to invoke from the memories of anyone who had played deck tennis with British partners the continuous, "Good shot, partner!" "Hard luck, partner!" which is an inseparable part of the verbal etiquette of the game. The American, however, seeing international relationships primarily in a business context, associated the word with a business partnership, in which the relationship is conventionally asymmetrical —one partner putting up the funds, the other providing the brains or the entry, but neither committed to a social relationship with the other, with an expectation of the partnership lasting until it is disrupted by disagreement or death, and with no obligation on either to boast or grieve for the other partner. Therefore, a careful British attempt to boast for their partners (as in the case of the great emphasis given to the American contribution to bringing down the buzz bombs) was met by the Americans, not by a little piece of symmetrical vicarious boasting, about, say, the landing platforms, but instead by blow-ups in the American papers of what the British had said about the buzz bombs. This produced inevitable confusion, and even some abortive attempts on the part of the British to do their own boasting.

Conclusion

The methods described in this paper are anthropological methods.

That is, they rely upon an understanding of the cultural patterns of the peoples involved, and they invoke regularities for purposes of clarification. It is, however, important to recognize that clarification alone will not promote understanding,—that it is still necessary to set some tone within which feeling may flow freely. In the presentations and teaching described in this paper, I relied on several methods which invoked feeling: first, emphasizing symmetries and, when possible, reducing to symmetrical terms what looked like complementary contrasts; second, giving a description of the other peoples' behavior in terms which made *identification* possible (*e.g.*, in the description of the breakfast table, it is possible for listeners of each nationality to imagine what it would be like to be in the reciprocal exhibitionist position); and, third, on arousing the kind of laughter which comes from the exactitude of the cultural statement. Members of an audience invariably laughed hardest at the description of their own cultural behavior, not at that of the others. To obtain this effect, it is very important to avoid caricature, which is self-defeating. The device also fails if there are many expatriates in an audience, since these are likely to see their home culture with a degree of distortion that makes any exact description, which will invoke the laughter of recognition from others, seem to them a caricature,—usually a hostile caricature. In other words, the method failed when it was used with those who were themselves highly ambivalent about their own culture, and over-accepting of the other. Significantly enough, attempts to give equally exact descriptions of German behavior have usually failed to evoke the same sort of recognition from Germans in this country. It is possible that this method is best suited to cultures and situations in which ambivalence towards the own culture is least in evidence.

Undoubtedly, in other interpretative hands or in different media, other ways of evoking feeling would be more appropriate than the deliberate attempt to embody the clarifying statement in exact, laughter-producing *verbatim* vignettes. That the method is suitable for more than one culture is evidenced by the very similar response which I received from British and American audiences when I gave the same material, in the same way. At the same time, the evocation of pity, or eager purposive aspiration, may also be feeling states which might appropriately accompany the type of clarification which an initial objective anthropological analysis of cultural patterns provides.

Evoking either fear or anger runs, I believe, into the danger of stirring up, in the audience, feelings which interfere with acceptance of the clarification. Strong identification is possible with an evocation of fear or anger, but the identification tends to be so strong as to interfere with the degree of distance which is necessary both for laughter and for an understanding of difference.

If we are to build a world in which a variety of cultures are orchestrated together so as to produce a viable social order, we need intensive exploration of the types of clarification and types of presentation which will increase understanding between pairs of cultural groups and then among more complicated groupings.

LITERATURE CITED

1. **Bateson, G.**
   1942. Some systematic approaches to the study of culture and personality. Character and Personality XI, **1**: 76–84.
2. **Bateson, G.**
   1942. Morale and National Character. In, *Civilian Morale*, 2nd. yearbook of S.P.S.S.I.: 71–91. Houghton Mifflin Co. Boston.
3. **Bateson, G., & M. Mead**
   1941. Principles of morale building. J. Educ. Sociol. **15**(4): 206–220.
4. **Benedict, R.**
   1946. The study of cultural patterns in European nations. Trans. N. Y. Acad. Sci., Ser. II, **8**(8): 274–279.
5. **Benedict, R.**
   1947. The Chrysanthemum and the Sword. Houghton Mifflin Co. Boston.
6. **Brewster, O.**
   1945. Let's not be suckers again. American Magazine, January issue: 24–26, 93–98.
7. **Dyer, A. M., & M. Mead**
   1944. It's human nature. CBS Broadcast. Education **65**(4): 228–239.
8. **Gorer, G.**
   1943. Themes in Japanese culture. Trans. N. Y. Acad. Sci., Ser. II, **5**(5): 105–124.
9. **Mead, M.**
   1942. And Keep your Powder Dry. William Morrow & Co. New York.
10. **Mead, M.**
    1942. Preface From England. Preface to: *The American Character*, vii–xi. Pelican Books. Harmondsworth, England.
11. **Mead, M.**
    1942. And Keep your Powder Dry. William Morrow & Co. New York.
12. **Mead, M.**
    1942. Brothers and Sisters and Success. VII: 54–70 in: *And Keep your Powder Dry*. William Morrow & Co. New York.

13. Mead, M.
1942. The Chip on the Shoulder. IX: 138–158 in: *And Keep your Powder Dry.* William Morrow & Co. New York.

14. Mead, M.
1943. Why we Americans talk big. The Listener **30**: 772. B. B. C., London.

15. Mead, M.
1943. Can you tell one American from another? The Listener **30**: 777. B. B. C., London.

16. Mead, M.
1943. Anthropological techniques in war psychology. Bull. Menninger Clinic **7**: 137–140.

17. Mead, M.
1944. The American Troops and the British Community. Pamphlet. Hutchinson. London.

18. Mead, M.
1944. Ferment in British education: some impressions of educational thinking in England. J. Am. Assoc. Univ. Women **37**(3): 131–133.

19. Mead, M.
1944. A G.I. View of Britain. New York Times Magazine, March 19: 18–19, 34.

20. Mead, M.
1944. What is a date? Transatlantic **10**: 54, 57–60.

21. Mead, M.
1944. A Bread and Butter Letter from a Lecturer. (Washington.) Occidental College, Los Angeles.

22. Mead, M.
1944. The American Troops and the British Community. An Examination of the Relationship between the American Troops and the British. Hutchinson. London.

23. Metraux, R.
1943. Qualitative attitude analysis—a technique for the study of verbal behavior. Bull. Nat. Res. Council **108**: 86–95.

24. Wheeler, B. K.
1945. Critics air U.S.-British views. Washington Star, January 14.

25. Parsons, T.
1945. The problem of controlled institutional change: an essay in applied social science. Psychiat. **8**(1): 79–101.

26. Committee Report
1943. The Problem of Changing Food Habits. Report of the Committee on Food Habits, 1941–1943. Bull. Nat. Res. Council **108.**

27. Round Table
1945. Germany after the war. Am. J. Orthopsychiat. **15**(3): 381–441.

SECTION OF BIOLOGY

JANUARY 10 AND 11, 1947

Conference on *"The Mechanics of Development."*

The Section of Biology held a Conference on "The Mechanics of Development." Doctor Roberts Rugh, New York University, New York, N. Y., was the Conference Chairman in charge of the meeting.

The program consisted of the following papers:

FRIDAY, JANUARY 10

Morning Session: The Egg in Maturation, Fertilization, and Early Cleavage. Chairman, L. G. Barth, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

"Ooplasmic Segregation in Relation to Differentiation," by Donald P. Costello, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.

"The Organization of the Amphibian Egg during Fertilization and Cleavage," by G. Fankhauser, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

"Significance of the Cell Membrane in Embryological Processes," by Johannes Holtfreter, Rochester University, Rochester, N. Y.

Afternoon Session: Gastrulation, Determination, and Localization. Chairman, E. G. Conklin, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey.

"Prospective Areas and Differentiation Potencies in the Chick Blastoderm," by Dorothea Rudnick, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

"Biochemical Differentiation during Amphibian Development," by E. J. Boell, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

"Form Changes During Pregastrular Development," by J. S. Nicholas, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 11

Regeneration. Chairman, Ross G. Harrison, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

"The Role of Nerves in the Regeneration of Amphibian Limbs," by S. Meryl Rose, Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts.

"Quantitative Studies on Locomotor Responses in *Amblystoma* Larvae following Surgical Alterations in the Nervous System," by S. R. Detwiler, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

"Functional Polarization in Developing and Regenerating Retinae of Transplanted Eyes," by L. S. Stone, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

SECTION OF PSYCHOLOGY

JANUARY 17 AND 18, 1947

Conference on *"Current Trends in Clinical Psychology."*

The Section of Psychology held a Conference on "Current Trends in Clinical Psychology." Doctor S. Stansfeld Sargent, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y., was the Conference Chairman in charge of the meeting.

The program consisted of the following papers:

FRIDAY, JANUARY 17

Directive and Non-Directive Therapy. Chairman, Anne Roe.

"Theoretical Foundations of Directive Psychotherapy," by Frederick C. Thorne, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont.

"Some Dynamic Aspects of Non-Directive Therapy," by Arthur W. Combs, School of Education, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 18

Morning Session: Group Psychotherapy. Chairman, Morris Krugman, New York Bureau of Child Guidance, Board of Education, New York, N. Y.

"The Theory and Practice of Group Psychotherapy," by Helen E. Durkin, Scarsdale, N. Y.

"Psychodrama as a Way of Group Psychotherapy," by J. L. Moreno, Psychodramatic Institute, New York, N. Y.

Afternoon Session: World War II and the Future. Chairman, Emily Thorp Burr, Psychological and Vocational Service, New York, N. Y.

"What Did the Clinical Psychologist Learn from the War?" by Max L. Hutt, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

"Future Training in Clinical Psychology," by James G. Miller, Division of Clinical Psychology, Veterans Administration, Washington, D. C.

SECTION OF BIOLOGY

JANUARY 24 AND 25, 1947

Conference on *"Thyroid Function as Disclosed by Newer Methods of Study."*

The Section of Biology held a Conference on "Thyroid Function as Disclosed by Newer Methods of Study." Doctor J. H. Means, Medical Clinic of Harvard Medical School at Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, was the Conference Chairman in charge of the meeting.

The program consisted of the following papers:

FRIDAY, JANUARY 24

"Introductory Remarks," by the Conference Chairman.

"Phylogeny of the Thyroid: Descriptive and Experimental," by E. D. Goldsmith, Department of Anatomy, College of Dentistry, New York University, New York, N. Y.

"Cytological and Cytochemical Bases of Thyroid Function," by E. De Robertis, School of Medicine, National University, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

"The Chemical Cytology of the Thyroid Gland," by Edward W. Dempsey, Department of Anatomy, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts.

"The Metabolic Circuit of the Thyroid Hormone," by W. T. Salter, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, Connecticut.

"Studies on the Formation of Organically-Bound Iodine Compounds in the Thyroid Gland, and Their Appearance in Plasma as Shown by the Use of Radioactive Iodine," by I. L. Chaikoff and Alvin Taurog, University of California Medical School, Los Angeles, California.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 25

"Iodine Absorption and Utilization under the Influence of Certain Goitrogens," by D. A. McGinty, Parke-Davis, Inc., Detroit, Michigan.

"Mechanism of Action of Various Antithyroid Compounds," by E. B. Astwood, Joseph H. Pratt Diagnostic Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts.

"Studies on the Metabolism of Thyroxine in the Body," by C. P. Leblond, Department of Anatomy, McGill University, Montreal, Canada.

"The Formation of Thyroxine in Iodinated Proteins," by E. P. Reineke, Department of Physiology and Pharmacology, Michigan State College, East Lansing, Michigan.

"The Biochemistry of the Thyrotropic Hormone," by Alexander Albert, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota.

"Physiologic Reactions of Thyrotropic Hormone," by Rulon W. Rawson, Medical Clinic of Harvard Medical School at Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts.

THE NEW YORK ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

announces

THE A. CRESSY MORRISON PRIZE CONTEST FOR 1947

The New York Academy of Sciences announces three prizes offered by Mr. A. Cressy Morrison, to be known as the A. Cressy Morrison Prizes I, II and III, all of which will be awarded in December, 1947. Prize I, of $500, will be awarded for the best paper on solar and stellar energy. Prizes II and III will be awarded for the best papers on a scientific subject included within the field of The New York Academy of Sciences and its Affiliated Societies. The terms governing these competitions are detailed herewith.

Prize I

A prize of $500 is offered for the paper adjudged by the Council of the Academy to be the most meritorious contribution on the subject of the source of solar and stellar energy.

Prodigious progress has been made since the first A. Cressy Morrison Prize on this subject was awarded in 1926,* to Donald H. Menzel of Lick Observatory, University of California, for his paper entitled *"The Source of Solar Energy."* The same author, in collaboration with P. B. Gerasimovic of Harvard College Observatory, also won the prize awarded in December, 1928, for their paper on *"Sub-Atomic Energy and Stellar Radiation."* In 1930, the prize was awarded to Professor H. von Zeipel, of the University of Upsala, Sweden, for his paper entitled *"The Evolution and Constitution of Stars."* The most recent prizes were awarded in 1938 to Hans Bethe for his paper on *"Energy Production in Stars,"* and in 1940 to R. E. Marshak and Hans Bethe for their paper entitled *"The Sources of Stellar Energy."*

It is, however, felt that the complete answer has not yet been given and many questions remain open. For example, no final model for the sun, properly satisfying the observed luminosity and the hydrodynamical considerations, has been published, and only a start has been made on the problem of the so-called "red giants," "sub dwarfs," and "white dwarfs." Other related problems will doubtless suggest themselves to research workers. Through the continued interest of Mr. Morrison and his desire to stimulate further research in the subject, the above prize will be renewed for award in 1947.

Prizes II and III

Two prizes of $200 each, offered by Mr. A. Cressy Morrison, to be known as the A. Cressy Morrison Prizes in Natural Science, will be awarded at the Annual meeting, December, 1947, for the two most acceptable papers in a field of science covered by the Academy or an Affiliated Society.

* The subject for competition originally suggested by Mr. Morrison was as follows:

"The principle source of energy of the sun is intra-atomic energy existing within the normal atom itself which is released from the atom under the conditions of temperature and pressure which exist in the sun."

Conditions

(1) Eligibility. The competition for Prize I is open to all. Authors and co-authors competing for prizes II and III shall be members in good standing of The New York Academy of Sciences and Affiliated Societies, but non-members may become eligible by joining one of these organizations before the closing date.

(2) Date. Papers are to be submitted on or prior to October 15, 1947, to the Executive Secretary of The New York Academy of Sciences, at The American Museum of Natural History, Central Park West at 79th Street, New York, N. Y.

(3) Papers. All papers submitted must embody the results of original research not previously published. The manuscript shall be typewritten, in English, accompanied by all necessary photographs, drawings, diagrams and tables, and shall be ready for publication. Papers must be accompanied by a summary of the data presented and conclusions reached.

(4) Awards. The awards shall be made by the Council of The New York Academy of Sciences. If, in the opinion of the judges, no paper worthy of a prize is offered, the award of a prize or prizes will be omitted for this contest.

(5) Publication. The Academy shall have first option on the publication of all papers submitted, unless especially arranged for beforehand with the authors, but such publication is not binding on the Academy.

(6) Wherever and whenever published, the papers awarded the prizes shall be accompanied by the statement: "Awarded an A. Cressy Morrison Prize in Natural Science in 1947 by The New York Academy of Sciences."

Such statement in substance must also accompany any formal publicity initiated by the author regarding the prize paper. If published elsewhere, six copies of each prize paper must be deposited shortly after publication with the office of The New York Academy of Sciences.

THE NEW YORK ACADEMY OF SCIENCES,

Central Park West at 79th Street, New York, N. Y.

EUNICE THOMAS MINER,
Executive Secretary.

NEW MEMBERS

ELECTED DECEMBER 13, 1946, AND JANUARY 23, 1947

SUSTAINING MEMBERSHIP

Biskind, Morton S., M.D., Endocrinology, Nutrition. Associate Endocrinologist, Beth Israel Hospital, New York, N. Y.

Dwight, Barbara, M.A., Physics. Graduate Student, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

Pacini, August J., Ph.D., Biochemistry. Vice-President and General Manager, Algin Corporation of America, New York, N. Y.

Siemer, Carleton A., Mineralogy, Physics. Power Plant Group Engineer, P84 Jet Project, Republic Aviation Corporation, Farmingdale, Long Island, N. Y.

ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP

Ahrens, Edward H., Jr., M.D., Metabolism. Resident Assistant, Hospital of the Rockefeller Institute, New York, N. Y.

Alba, Ralph T., Biological Chemistry. Chemist, Overly Biochemical Research Foundation, New York, N. Y.

Altmaier, Carl Lewis, Jr., Ph.D. Assistant Branch Chief Clinical Psychologist, Veterans Administration, New York Branch No. 2, New York, N. Y.

Anslow, William Parker, Jr., Ph.D., Physiology, Biochemistry. Instructor in Physiology, New York University College of Medicine, New York, N. Y.

Aranow, Henry, Jr., Sc.D. Instructor in Medicine, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

Archdeacon, James William, Ph.D. Assistant Professor of Physiology, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky.

Armstrong, Marvin Douglas, Ph.D. Assistant Research Professor of Biochemistry, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Baker, Donald Wyckoff, Ph.D., Biology, Animal Parasitology. Associate Professor, Veterinary Parasitology, College of Veterinary Medicine, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

Bakwin, Harry, M.D. Associate Professor of Pediatrics, New York University, New York, N. Y.

Barnett, Henry Lewis, M.D., Pediatric Clinical Physiology, Biochemistry. Assistant Professor, Cornell University Medical School, New York, N. Y.

Bartels, Charles R., M.S., Chemical Engineering Process Research. Research Chemical Engineer, E. R. Squibb and Sons, New Brunswick, N. J.

Baxter, James H., M.D., Medical Sciences, Chemistry. Welch Fellow (National Research Council), Department of Chemistry, Cornell University Medical College, New York, N. Y.

Beatrice, Sister Mary, M.S., Experimental Embryology. Instructor, St. Joseph's College for Women, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Bendich, Aaron, Ph.D., Biochemistry. Chemist, The Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research, New York, N. Y.

Berliner, Victor R., Ph.D., Physiology of Reproduction. Director, Division of Animal Industry, Ortho Research Foundation, Raritan, N. J.

Berne, Robert M., M.D., Medicine. New York, N. Y.

Binkley, S. B., Ph.D., Chemistry. Director of Chemical Research, Bristol Laboratories, Inc., Syracuse, N. Y.

Bluestein, Ben A., Ph.D., Chemistry. Research Chemist, Research Laboratory, General Electric Company, Schenectady, N. Y.

Blumenfeld, Max D., B.S., Biochemistry, Microbiology. Research Chemist, Heyden Chemical Corporation, New York, N. Y.

Bobrow, Roman, Ch.D., Yeast Fermentations, Protein Hydrolysates. Director of Production, Development, and Control, Atlantic Yeast Corporation, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Bodensteine, Dietrich, Biology, Experimental Physiology and Morphology. Physiologist, Edgewood Arsenal Medical Division, Edgewood Arsenal, Md.

Boldebuck, Edith M., Ph.D., Inorganic Chemistry. Research Chemist, Research Laboratory, General Electric Company, Schenectady, N. Y.

Bolton, Robert, B.S., Veterinary Anaerobes. Bacteriologist, Research Department, Lederle Laboratories Division, American Cyanamid Company, Pearl River, N. Y.

Breivik, Orville N., Ph.D., Organic and Biological Chemistry. Organic Research Unit Head (D), The Fleischmann Laboratories, New York, N. Y.

Brescia, Michael A., M.D., Diphtheria Immunity. Assistant Attending Physician, Willard-Parker Hospital; Assistant Pediatrician, St. John's Long Island City Hospital; Medical Inspector, Division of Child Hygiene, New York City Department of Health, New York, N. Y.

Brook, Abraham J., B.S., Biochemistry, Bacteriology. Biochemist, Nutritional Products Laboratory, E. R. Squibb and Sons, New Brunswick, N. J.

Brouillard, Robert E., Ph.D., Organic Dyes and Pigments. Assistant Chief Chemist, Calco Chemical Division, American Cyanamid Company, Somerville, N. J.

Buck, Johannes Sybrandt, Ph.D., Pharmaceuticals. Associate Director of Chemical Research, Sterling-Winthrop Research Institute, Rensselaer, N. Y.

Bump, Warner S., M.D., General Surgery. Attending Surgeon to St. Mary's Hospital, Rhinelander, Wisconsin.

Cabasso, Victor, Sc.D. Bacteriologist, Lederle Laboratories Division, American Cyanamid Company, Pearl River, N. Y.

Calahan, Harold A., M.A., Geography, Astronomy. Extension Director, New York Mirror, New York, N. Y.

Carter, Herbert E., Ph.D., Biochemistry. Professor of Chemistry, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

Chinard, Francis P., M.D., Clinical Chemistry. Assistant, Hospital of the Rockefeller Institute, New York, N. Y.

Christ, Charles L., Ph.D., Molecular Structure (Chemical Physics). Group Leader, X-Ray Diffraction, American Cyanamid Company, Stamford, Conn.

Churg, Jacob, M.D., Experimental Pathology. Pathologist, Barnert Memorial Hospital, Paterson, N. J.

Civin, W. Harold, M.D. Resident in Pathology, The Mount Sinai Hospital, New York, N. Y.

Clapp, James W., M.S., Organic Chemistry. Research Chemist, American Cyanamid Company, Stamford, Conn.

Cohen, Hilliard, M.D., Medicine, Pathology. Fellow in Pathology, The Mount Sinai Hospital, New York, N. Y.

Cohen, Samuel, M.D., Biology, Physiological Chemistry, Medicine. Senior Resident Physician, Berthold S. Pollak Hospital for Chest Diseases, Medical Center, Jersey City, N. J.

Cornman, Ivor, M.S., Cytology. Associate, Sloan-Kettering Institute, New York, N. Y.

Couch, James F., Ph.D., Organic Chemistry. Chemist, Eastern Regional Research Laboratory, Philadelphia, Pa.

Cubicciotti, Daniel D., Jr., Ph.D., Physical Chemistry. Instructor in Chemistry, New York University, New York, N. Y.

Cutter, Robert K., M.D., Biologicals and Pharmaceuticals. President, Cutter Laboratories, Berkeley, Calif.

Dalton, Albert J., Ph.D., Cytology of Cancer. Senior Cytologist, National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, Md.

Daugherty, Nadine Sue, A.B., Pharmacology Research. Research Assistant, Lederle Laboratories Division, American Cyanamid Company, Pearl River, N. Y.

Derner, Gordon Frederick, M.A., Clinical Psychology. Lecturer in Psychology, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

Dickman, Sherman R., Ph.D. Research Associate in Biochemistry, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

Djerassi, Carl, Ph.D., Biochemistry and Organic Chemistry. Research Chemist, Ciba Pharmaceutical Products, Inc., Summit, N. J.

Domingo, Emil, Public Health in Relation to Foods, Optics in Relation to Microscopy. Health Inspector, New York City Department of Health, New York, N. Y.

Eiler, John J., Ph.D., Biochemistry. Associate Professor of Biochemistry and Pharmacology, University of California Medical Center, San Francisco, Calif.

Eisenberg, Max A., M.S., Bacteriology and Biochemistry. Instructor, Biology Department, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Engel, Karl H., Ph.D. Research Chemist, National Aniline Division, Allied Chemical and Dye Corporation, New York, N. Y.

Eversole, Wilburn J., Ph.D., Endocrinology. Assistant Professor of Zoology, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.

Farrell, Michael A., Ph.D., Bacteriology and Biochemistry. Professor and Head of Department of Bacteriology, Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.

Ferraro, Louis R., M.D. Director of Pathology, Fordham Hospital, New York, N. Y.

Fink, Harold Kenneth, Ph.D., Psychotherapy. Director, Psychological Services Division, Personality Analysis and Research, Inc., New York, N. Y.

Fishman, Alfred P., M.D., Medicine. Dazian Foundation Fellow in Pathology, The Mount Sinai Hospital, New York, N. Y.

Fleischmann, Walter, Ph.D., Physiology, Endocrinology. Acting Chief, Clinical Physiology Section, Edgewood Arsenal, Md.

Flemister, Launce J., Ph.D., Physiology. Research Associate, Medical Research Division, Sharp and Dohme, Inc., Glenolden, Pa.

Flemister, Sarah Culbreth, Ph.D., Physiology. Research Associate, Martin Biological Laboratory, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.

Franklin, Alfred L., Ph.D., Biochemistry and Nutrition. Research Biochemist, Nutrition Department, Lederle Laboratories Division, American Cyanamid Company, Pearl River, N. Y.

Fried, Josef, Ph.D., Organic and Biochemistry. Associate Member, Squibb Institute for Medical Research, New Brunswick, N. J.

Galey, John Taylor, B.S., Geology. Geologist and Gas Producer, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Garb, Solomon, M.D. Research Fellow in Pharmacology, Cornell University Medical School, New York, N. Y.

Garner, Raymond L., Ph.D., Biological Chemistry. Assistant Professor, University of Michigan Medical School, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Gaunt, William E., Ph.D., Chemistry, Biochemistry, Nutrition. Technical Director, Product Development, E. R. Squibb and Sons, New Brunswick, N. J.

Gebhart, Arthur I., Ph.D., Organic Chemistry. Organic Research Chemist, Colgate-Palmolive-Peet Company, Hoboken, N. J.

Genghof, Dorothy Schaefer, Ph.D., Bacteriology. Research Associate in Biochemistry, Cornell University Medical College, New York, N. Y.

Germann, Richard Paul, B.A., Chemistry, Physics, Bacteriology. Research Chemist, Calco Chemical Division, American Cyanamid Company, Bound Brook, N. J.

Gershon, Herman, M.S., Chemistry. Research Chemist (Organic), International Mineral and Chemical Corporation, Scarsdale, N. Y.

Gettler, Joseph Daniel, Ph.D., Physical Chemistry. Instructor, Department of Chemistry, New York University, New York, N. Y.

Gibson, Augustus, M.D., Experimental Medicine. Assistant Medical Director, Merck and Company, Inc., Rahway, N. J.

Gill, Edna Risdon, A.B., Biology. Research Assistant in Pharmacology, Lederle Laboratories Division, American Cyanamid Company, Pearl River, N. Y.

Goldberg, Henry P., M.D., Pediatrics, Rheumatic Fever, Heart Disease. Research Fellow in Pediatrics, New York Hospital, New York, N. Y.

Goldforb, A. J., Ph.D., Physiology, Experimental Embryology. Professor of Biology, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y.

Gottesman, Elihu, M.S., Vitamins in Foods and Pharmaceuticals. Assistant Supervisor, Analytical Laboratory, Endo Products, Inc., Richmond Hill, N. Y.

Goudey, Earl, M.A., Biology. Science Teacher, High School, Bronxville, N. Y.

Grady, Audrey F., B.A., Biology and Chemistry. Control Chemist, Chemical Warfare Service, Westbury Chemical Company, Inc., Jersey City, N. J.

Grand, C. G., Biological and Medical Research. Graduate Student and Research Associate, New York University, Department of Biology; St. Vincent's Hospital, New York, N. Y.

Green, Ray Edward, M.D., Pharmacology. Pharmacologist, Medical Corps, United States Army, Medical Division, Edgewood Arsenal, Md.

Greene, Harry Jonathan, M.D., Biochemistry. Brooklyn, N. Y.

Gregor, Harry P., Ph.D. Assistant Professor of Physical Chemistry, Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Greisheimer, Esther M., Ph.D., Anaesthesia. Professor of Physiology, Temple University School of Medicine, Philadelphia, Pa.

Gruenwald, Peter, M.D., Biology (Vertebrate Embryology and Developmental Pathology). Instructor in Pathology, Long Island College of Medicine, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Halliday, Sybella LeBrun, A.B., Biology, Physiology. Research Assistant, Pharmacology, Lederle Laboratories Division, American Cyanamid Company, Pearl River, N. Y.

Halpern, Jacob, M.D., Internal Medicine. Assistant in Medicine, Long Island College of Medicine, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Handelsman, Milton B., M.D., Metabolism, Biochemistry. Assistant Clinical Professor of Medicine, Long Island College of Medicine, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Harman, Pinckney Jones, Ph.D. Assistant Professor of Anatomy, New York University College of Medicine, New York, N. Y.

Harmssen, Ruth G., B.S., Psychology. Clerk and Interviewer, Personnel Department, Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, New York, N. Y.

Harris, Albert J., Ph.D., Clinical and Educational Psychology. Assistant Professor, Supervisor, Remedial Reading Service, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y.

Harrow, Benjamin, Ph.D., Biochemistry. Professor of Chemistry, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y.

Harvey, Edmund N., Jr., Ph.D., Surface Chemistry. Research Chemist, Interchemical Corporation, New York, N. Y.

Hassett, Charles C., Ph.D., Insect Physiology. Entomologist, Chemical Corporation, Edgewood Arsenal, Md.

Hearon, John Z., Ph.D., Biochemistry, Tissue Respiration. Senior Research Fellow, National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, Md.

Heilborn, George, Geology. Management in Restorative Plastic Dentistry, New York, N. Y.

Heiman, Helen Ilona, M.D., Surgery. Adjunct in Surgery, Sydenham Hospital, New York, N. Y.

Helbig, W. A., Ch.E., Activated Carbon. Chemical Engineer, Darco Corporation, New York, N. Y.

Hendlin, David, M.S., Biology, Microbiology. Research Microbiologist, Merck and Company, Inc., Rahway, N. J.

Heston, Walter E., Ph.D., Genetics, Cancer Research. Principal Geneticist, National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, Md.

Higgins, George Kendall, Ph.D., Medicine and Related Sciences. Head of Department and Professor of Pathology, New York Medical College, New York, N. Y.

Higgins, Vivian M., B.S., Geology. Scarsdale, N. Y.

Hill, David L., Ph.D., Enzymes, Metabolism. Insect Physiologist, Entomology Section, Medical Division, Edgewood Arsenal, Md.

Hirs, Christophe Henri Werner, B.Sc., Chemical Interrelations of Biological Materials. Assistant in Biochemistry, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

Hitzig, William Maxwell, M.D., Cardiovascular and Circulatory Studies. Adjunct Physician, The Mount Sinai Hospital, New York, N. Y.

Holodnak, Helen Barbara, M.A., Clinical Psychology. Chief Psychologist, Institute for the Crippled and Disabled, New York, N. Y.

Holt, Joseph Paynter, Ph.D., Physiology, Cardiovascular System, Toxicology. Research Director, Medical Department, Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, New York, N. Y.

Holt, L. Emmett, Jr., M.D., Pediatrics, Biochemistry, Nutrition. Professor of Pediatrics, New York University, New York, N. Y.

Homburger, Freddy, M.D., Studies on Human Metabolism, especially in Cancer. Research Clinician, Sloan-Kettering Laboratory for Cancer; Instructor in Medicine, Cornell University Medical College, New York, N. Y.

Hooper, Irving R., Ph.D., Biochemistry, Organic Chemistry. Project Leader, Chemistry Research, Bristol Laboratories, Syracuse, N. Y.

Huebner, Charles F., Ph.D., Biochemistry. Assistant in Chemical Pharmacology, Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, New York, N. Y.

Hughes, Walter L., Jr., Ph.D., Protein Chemistry. Associate, Department of Physical Chemistry, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Mass.

Hunt, Carlton C., M.D. Research Fellow in Pharmacology, Cornell University Medical College, New York, N. Y.

Hoyt, John M., Ph.B., Chemistry, Biology. Control Chemist, Fiske Brothers Refining Company, Newark, N. J.

Illick, J. Theron, Ph.D., Cytology, Genetics. Associate Professor of Zoology, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.

Ischlondsky, N. Dorin, M.D., Brain Physiology of Normal and Abnormal Behavior. New York, N. Y.

Ives, Olive Lord, Ph.D., Psychological and Vocational Counseling. Counselor, Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, N. J.

Jackson, Elizabeth B., B.A., Virus and Rickettsial Diseases. Bacteriologist, Virus Division, Army Medical School, Washington, D. C.

Janowitz, Henry D., M.D., Clinical Research in Gastroenterology. Fellow, Department of Pathology, Mount Sinai Hospital, New York, N. Y.

Jenne, Herbert J., V.M.D. Director, Brucellosis Control Division, State of New Jersey, Trenton, N. J.

Jepsen, Glenn L., Ph.D., Vertebrate Paleontology, Evolution, Geology. Sinclair Professor of Vertebrate Paleontology, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

Johnson, Hilding R., B.S., Analytical and Organic Chemistry. Analytical Research Chemist, Heyden Chemical Corporation, New York, N. Y.

Kannerstein, Milton, M.D. Fellow in Pathology, Mount Sinai Hospital, New York, N. Y.

Kaplan, Ira L., M.D., Cancer. Director, Radiation Therapy Department, Bellevue Hospital, New York, N. Y.

Karnofsky, David A., M.D., Medicine. Research Associate, Sloan-Kettering Institute, New York, N. Y.

Kassuba, Frank J., Ph.D. Manager, Chemistry Research Laboratory, Ansco, Binghamton, N. Y.

Kaufman, Herman S., M.S., Large Molecules. Research Fellow, Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Kay, Saul, M.D. Resident in Pathology, New York Postgraduate Medical School and Hospital, New York, N. Y.

Kelner, Albert, Ph.D., Bacteriology. Research Bacteriologist, Biological Laboratory, Cold Spring Harbor, Long Island, N. Y.

Kisch, Bruno, M.D., Biology, Medicine. Professor, Yeshiva University, New York, N. Y.; Research Fellow, Fordham University, New York, N. Y.

Kivy, Evelyn, M.A., Embryology. Instructor, Biology Department, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Klein, Harold R., D.D.S., Electron Microscope in Dentistry. Assistant Clinical Professor, New York University College of Dentistry, New York, N. Y.

Kremers, Roland E., Ph.D., Organic Chemistry, Plant and Food Chemistry. Director of Basic Research, Central Research Laboratories, General Foods Corporation, Hoboken, N. J.

Kress, Bernard H., M.A., High Polymer and Organic Chemistry. Research Chemist, Resin Research Division, Celanese Corporation, Newark, N. J.

Kuselewitz, Leah, M.A., Microbiology, Biochemistry. Microbiologist, Merck and Company, Inc., Rahway, N. J.

Kutisker, Meyer J., M.D., Medicine. Assistant Professor of Clinical Surgery, New York University, New York, N. Y.

Lapedes, Daniel N., M.A., Microbiology, Antibiotics. Research Associate, Squibb Institute for Medical Research, New Brunswick, N. J.

Larner, Joseph, M.D., Medicine, Biochemistry. Biochemist, Medical Corps, United States Army, Biochemical Department, Medical Division, Edgewood Arsenal, Md.

Larsen, Alma H., M.A., Microbiology, Biochemistry. Microbiologist, Merck and Company, Inc., Rahway, N. J.

Lazarow, Arnold, M.D., Cytochemistry. Assistant Professor of Anatomy, Department of Anatomy, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

Lehr, Hanns H., Ph.D., Organic Chemistry, Chemotherapy. Senior Research Chemist, Hoffmann-LaRoche, Inc., Nutley, N. J.

Lehrman, Daniel S., B.S., Biology, Psychology. Psychologist, Haskins Laboratories, New York, N. Y.

Leuchtenberger, Rudolf G. H., M.D., Cancer Research, Nutrition. Pathologist in Cancer Research, The Mount Sinai Hospital, New York, N. Y.

Linnick, Ida, M. A., Psychology. Chief Psychologist, Federation Employment Service, New York, N. Y.

Loeb, Harold G., Ph.D., Fat Metabolism, Nutrition, Neurochemistry. Biochemist, Kabat-Kaiser Institute, Washington, D. C.

Lolis, Kathleen, M.A., Clinical Psychology, Research on Rorschach and Projective Techniques. Psychologist, Bureau of Child Guidance, Board of Education, New York, N. Y.

Luft, Rolf, M.D., Internal Medicine, Endocrinology. Physician, University Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden.

Luhby, A. Leonard, M.D., Hematology. Charles F. Hood Fellow in Medicine, Hematology, Children's Hospital; Department of Pediatrics, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Mass.

Mason, Howard S., Ph.D., Organic Chemistry. Chemist, United States Public Health Service, National Institute of Health, Bethesda, Md.

McCarty, Maclyn, M.D., Medicine, Bacteriology. Associate, Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, New York, N. Y.

McCarty, William Ross, M.D., Surgery. Associate Professor of Surgery, New York University College of Medicine, New York, N. Y.

McLaren, A. Douglas, Ph.D., Biochemistry. Assistant Professor of Polymer Chemistry, Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mackenzie, Cosmo Glenn, Sc.D. Research Associate in Biochemistry, Cornell University Medical College, New York, N. Y.

Maltz, Maxwell, M.D., Cancer Research. Director, Department of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, West Side Hospital, New York, N. Y.

Merrill, Edward C., B.S., Chemistry. Assistant Vice-President, United Drug Company, Boston, Mass.

Miller, Grace B., B.A., Pharmacology. Member, Research Staff, Department of Pharmacology, Wellcome Research Laboratories, Tuckahoe, N. Y.

Mindell, Florence Miriam, Ph.D., Enzyme Chemistry. Research Fellow under Corn Industries Research Foundation Grant, Department of Chemistry, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

Mirick, George S., M.D. Associate Professor of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, Medical School, Baltimore, Md.

Montagna, William, Ph.D., Histochemistry, Cytology, Embryology. Instructor in Anatomy, Long Island College of Medicine, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Montoya, Alberto, M.D., Physics and Chemistry. Assistant Volunteer in Pathology, The Mount Sinai Hospital, New York, N. Y.

Morris, Harold P., Ph.D., Nutrition in Relation to Cancer. Senior Nutrition Chemist, National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, Md.

Mowat, John H., Ph.D. Organic Chemist, Lederle Laboratories Division, American Cyanamid Company, Pearl River, N. Y.

Mullin, William Gordon, M.D., Hematology, Serology. Fellow in Pathology, University of Vermont Medical School, Burlington, Vt.

Mysels, Karol J., Ph.D., Chemistry. Instructor, Chemistry Department, New York University, New York, N. Y.

Najjar, Victor A., M.D., Nutrition, Enzymology. Research Council Senior Pediatric Fellow in Biochemistry, Washington University Medical School, St. Louis, Mo.

Neumoyer, Clifton R., Ph.D., Organic Chemistry. Organic Chemist, Heyden Chemical Corporation, Garfield, N. J.

Nobel, Sidney, B.S., Clinical Biochemistry. Chemist, E. Leitz Optical Company, New York, N. Y.

Novelli, G. David, M.S., Biochemistry, Intermediary Cellular Metabolism. Research Fellow, The Commonwealth Fund, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Mass.

Oppenheimer, Bernard Sutro, M.D., Circulation. Clinical Professor of Medicine, Medical Department, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

Orenstein, Joseph N., M.D., Medicine. Brooklyn, N. Y.

Overman, Ralph S., Ph.D., Chemistry. Instructor, Cornell University Medical College, New York, N. Y.

Palmer, Tekla Fredsall, B.S. Assistant in Nutrition, Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Panofsky, Hans, Ph.D., Theoretical Meteorology. Assistant Professor, New York University, New York, N. Y.

Pansy, Felix E., M.S., Bacteriology. Research Assistant, Squibb Institute for Medical Research, New Brunswick, N. J.

Parks, Mark E., M.Sc., Vertebrate Anatomy, Histology. Instructor, Biology Department, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Parpart, Arthur K., Ph.D., Cellular Physiology. Professor of Biology, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

Patterson, Elizabeth Knight, Ph.D., Cytochemistry, Enzymes. Biochemist, Institute for Cancer Research, Lankenau Hospital, Philadelphia, Pa.

Pearson, Frank Arthur, A.B., Instrumentation in Chemistry and Biochemistry. Frank Pearson Associates, Instrument Design, New York, N. Y.

Peck, Franklin B., M.D., Diabetes mellitus. Associate Director, Medical Division, Eli Lilly and Company, Indianapolis, Ind.

Pennino, Charles J., M.S., Organic Chemistry (Synthesis). Research Chemist, Heyden Chemical Corporation, Garfield, N. J.

Perlmutt, Joseph H., M.A., Biology, Endocrinology. Graduate Student and Assistant in Biology; Class of 1877 Fellow in Biology, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

Perlzweig, W. A., Ph.D., Biochemistry, Nutrition. Professor of Biochemistry, Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, N. C.

Pitha, Carl Albert, M.S., Analytical, Inorganic, and Organic Research; Geology, Anthropology. In Charge, Analytical Research, Niagara Sprayer and Chemical Division, Food Machinery Corporation, Middleport, N. Y.

Pollack, Frank L., M.D., Medicine, Physiology, Biochemistry. Interne, Metropolitan Hospital, Welfare Island, N. Y.

Pollack, Herbert, Ph.D., Nutrition and Clinical Medicine. Associate Physician and Chief, Metabolism Clinics, Mount Sinai Hospital, New York, N. Y.

Ponder, Eric, M.D., General Physiology. Attending Physician, Nassau Hospital, Mineola, N. Y.

Prager, William L., Ph.D., Organic Chemistry. Professor of Chemistry, Department of Chemistry, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y.

Price, Fraser P., Ph.D., Chemistry. Research Associate, Research Laboratory, General Electric Company, Schenectady, N. Y.

Randeberg, Cecelia, M.S., Psychology. Elementary School Teacher, Jersey City, N. J.

Randel, Barbara, M.A., Exotic Fishes. Director, Aquarium Society, New York, N. Y.

Randel, Lyna, Exotic Fishes. President, Aquarium Society, New York, N. Y.

Ratner, Sarah, Ph.D., Biochemistry. Assistant Professor of Pharmacology, New York University College of Medicine, New York, N. Y.

Reilly, Hilda Christine, Ph.D. Research Assistant in Microbiology, New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station, New Brunswick, N. J.

Reiner, John M., Ph.D., Microbiology, Biochemistry, Physiology. National Research Council Fellow in Zoology, Washington University Medical School, St. Louis, Mo.

Reinhold, John Gunther, Ph.D., Medical Biochemistry, Nutrition, Pharmacology. Principal Biochemist, Philadelphia General Hospital; Assistant Professor in Physiological Chemistry, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Richardson, LaVange H., Ph.D., Speech Correction, Clinical Psychology. Personnel Counselor, Personnel Bureau, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y.

Roll, Paul M., Ph.D., Biochemistry. Research Assistant, Sloan-Kettering Institute, New York, N. Y.

Rosenman, Sanford B., Ph.D. Bacteriologist, Wyeth Institute of Applied Biochemistry, Philadelphia, Pa.

Ross, George, B.S., Clinical Chemistry. Chemist-in-Charge, Medical Division Laboratory, Montefiore Hospital, New York, N. Y.

Ross, Joseph F., M.D., Internal Medicine, Hematology, Iron Metabolism. Associate Professor in Medicine, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, Mass.

Roth, Barbara, Ph.D., Pharmaceutical Chemistry. Research Chemist, Calco Chemical Division, American Cyanamid Company, Bound Brook, N. J.

Rubenfeld, Sidney, M.D., Tumors. New York, N. Y.

Ruegsegger, J. M., M.D., Clinical Medicine. Clinical Investigation of Biologicals, Lederle Laboratories Division, American Cyanamid Company, Pearl River, N. J.

Russo-Alesi, Francis M., B.S., Organic Chemistry. Chemist, Squibb Institute for Medical Research, New Brunswick, N. J.

St. Andre, Arthur F., Ph.D., Chemical Research in Sex Hormones. Research Chemist, Ciba Pharmaceutical Products, Summit, N. J.

Sampath, Angus Clarence, Bacteriology. Research Assistant, Lederle Laboratories Division, American Cyanamid Company, Pearl River, N. Y.

Sawitsky, Arthur, M.D., Hematology. Fellow in Therapeutics, New York University College of Medicine, New York, N. Y.

Schmitt, Francis O., Ph.D., Physiology, Biophysics. Professor of Biology and Head of Department, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

Schoen, Karl, Ph.D., Chemistry. Research Chemist, Endo Products, Richmond Hill, N. Y.

Selin, Golden, M.D., Medicine and Related Sciences. Instructor in Pathology, New York Medical College, New York, N. Y.

Sevringhaus, Elmer L., M.D., Metabolic and Endocrine Disease. Director of Clinical Research, Hoffmann-LaRoche, Inc., Nutley, N. J.

Sharpless, George R., D.Sc., Biochemistry. Research Biochemist in Viruses, Lederle Laboratories Division, American Cyanamid Company, Pearl River, N. Y.

Simeone, Rose Mary, M.S., Pharmaceutical Chemistry. Research Chemist, Group Leader in Pharmaceutical Development, National Oil Products Company, Harrison, N. J.

Spirtes, Morris Albert, M.D., Biochemistry, Physiology. Research Fellow, National Research Council, Bethesda, Md.

Stats, Daniel, M.D. Research Assistant in Hematology, Mount Sinai Hospital, New York, N. Y.

Steinglass, Paul, M.S., Bacteriology, Antibiotic Research, Biological Sciences. Biologist, Schenley Distillers Corporation, Larchmont Research Laboratory, Larchmont, N. Y.

Stempel, Arthur, Ph.D., Organic Chemistry. Senior Research Chemist, Hoffmann-LaRoche, Inc., Nutley, N. J.

Styles, Helen, M.A., Organic Chemistry. Research Associate, Ortho Research Foundation, Raritan, N. J.

Tenenbaum, L. E., Ph.D., Organic and Biological Chemistry. Senior Chemist, Pyridium Corporation, Yonkers, N. Y.

Thompson, Walter E., Ph.D. Research Chemist, Colgate-Palmolive-Peet Company, Jersey City, N. J.

Torda, Clara, M.D., Biology, Physiology, Biochemistry, Chemistry, Physics, Mathematics. Research Fellow, Cornell University Medical College, New York, N. Y.

Turner, Richard, Ph.D., Pharmaceutical Chemistry. Research Chemist, Calco Chemical Division, American Cyanamid Company, Bound Brook, N. J.

Van Meter, John C., M.Sc., Biochemistry. Microbiologist, Analytical Department, Lederle Laboratories Division, American Cyanamid Company, Pearl River, N. Y.

Vessey, Robert E., Pharmacology, Physiology, Chemistry. Pharmacology Research Associate, Lederle Laboratories Division, American Cyanamid Company, Pearl River, N. Y.

Vogel, Henry J., M.Sc., Chemotherapy. Chief Chemist, E. A. H. Friedheim Laboratory, New York, N. Y.

Waddell, James, Ph.D., Biochemistry. Director, Biological Laboratory, E. I. duPont de Nemours and Company, New Brunswick, N. J.

Walker, Harry A., Ph.D., Pharmacology. Research Associate, Squibb Institute for Medical Research, New Brunswick, N. J.

Waterous, Mary Frances, M.A., Geology, Geography. Science Teacher, Brearley School, New York, N. Y.

Webb, John Schurr, Ph.D., Organic Chemistry. Research Chemist, Calco Chemical Division, American Cyanamid Company, Bound Brook, N. J.

Wechsler, Harry, M.S., Polymer Chemistry. Research Fellow, Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Weston, Raymond Edgar, Ph.D., Physiology. Assistant in Medicine, Montefiore Hospital, New York, N. Y.
Willheim, Robert, M.D., Biochemistry. Research Chemist, Mount Sinai Hospital, Chicago, Ill.
Williams, Emil F., B.S., Physics and Chemistry. Research, Physics Division, Stamford Research Laboratory, American Cyanamid Company, Stamford, Conn.
Williams, Robert R., M.D., Medicine, Immunochemistry. Assistant in Medicine, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
Witebsky, Ernest, M.D., Bacteriology and Immunology. Professor and Head of Department of Bacteriology and Immunology, University of Buffalo School of Medicine, Buffalo, N. Y.
Wolfe, Herbert Jay, B.S., High Polymers, Resins, Oils. Vice-President in Charge of Research, Kienle and Company, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Wollman, Seymour H., Ph.D., Physics and Biology. Associate, Physics Department, Sloan-Kettering Institute, New York, N. Y.
Worken, Barney, M.D., Research in Hodgkin's Disease. Fellow, Hodgkin's Research Fund, New York, N. Y.
Wright, Lemuel D., Ph.D., Biochemistry, Nutrition. Research Biochemist, Medical Research Division, Sharp and Dohme, Inc., Glenolden, Pa.
Youden, William J., Ph.D., Chemistry and Statistics. Physical Chemist, Boyce Thompson Institute for Plant Research, Yonkers, N. Y.
Yuda, Nicholas N., Ph.G., Pharmacology and Chemistry. Research Associate, Lederle Laboratories Division, American Cyanamid Company, Pearl River, N. Y.
Ziegler, William M., Ph.D., Organic Chemistry. Organic Chemist, Heyden Chemical Corporation, New York, N. Y.
Zillessen, Frederick O., M.D. Pathologist, Easton Hospital, Easton, Pa., and Warren Hospital, Phillipsburg, N. J.
Zweifach, Benjamin William, Ph.D., Physiology of Circulation. Research Associate in Medicine, Cornell University Medical College, New York, N. Y.

ASSOCIATE MEMBERSHIP

Baumann, Lisbeth, Biology. Associate in Oral Histology and Pathology, University of Pennsylvania Dental School, Philadelphia, Pa.
Cass, William E., Ph.D., Organic Chemistry. Research Chemist, General Electric Company, Schenectady, N. Y.
Copeland, Donald E., Ph.D., Cytology. Assistant Professor, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
Dalton, Howard C., Ph.D., Experimental Embryology. Instructor in Biology, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
Epple, Robert, B.S., Physical and Inorganic Chemistry. Instructor, Department of Chemistry, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
Heuser, Leon J., Ph.D., Organic Research. Division of Medicinal Chemistry, E. R. Squibb and Sons, New Brunswick, N. J.
Kauzmann, Walter, Ph.D., Physical Chemistry. Assistant Professor of Chemistry, Frick Chemical Laboratory, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
Layton, Laurence Laird, Ph.D. Assistant Professor of Biochemistry, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
McDowell, Wilbur Benedict, Ph.D., Organic Chemistry. Research Associate, Squibb Institute for Medical Research, New Brunswick, N. J.
Ohse, Albert, S.T.B., Psychiatry. Rector of Christ Church, Sparkill, N. Y., and Episcopal Chaplain, Rockland State Hospital, Rockland County, N. Y.

Pollack, Otakar J., Ph.D., Pathology in Fertility and Atherosclerosis. Director of Laboratories, Taunton State Hospital, Taunton, Mass.; Research Associate, Department of Legal Medicine, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Mass.; Pathologist, Wilmington General Hospital, Wilmington, Del.

Pribyl, Edward J., M.S., Pharmaceutical Chemistry. Associate, Squibb Institute for Medical Research, New Brunswick, N. J.

Price, Echo, M.S., Nutrition, Vitamins. Research Assistant, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.

Rabin, Albert, Ph.D., Psychopathology. Chief Psychologist, New Hampshire State Hospital, Concord, N. H.

Saunders, John W., Jr., M.S., Experimental Embryology. Junior Instructor in Biology, Department of Biology, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Wexler, Murray, M.A., Clinical Psychology. Psychologist, Connecticut State Hospital, Middletown, Conn.

Winslow, Earl Holden, Ph.D. Research Chemist, Research Laboratory, General Electric Company, Schenectady, N. Y.

Wyatt, Frederick, Ph.D., Psychology. Chief Psychologist, McLean Hospital, Waverly, Mass.

STUDENT MEMBERSHIP

Alexander, Carl S., B.A., Medical Research. Medical Student, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

Cirillo, Vincent P. Undergraduate Assistant in Biology, University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N. Y.

Holser, William Thomas, M.Sc., Geochemistry. Lecturer in Geology, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

Kream, Jacob, B.S., Biochemistry. Graduate Student, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

Rubin, Leonard, B.A., Physiology, Medicine. Medical Student, Long Island College of Medicine, Brooklyn, N. Y.